Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/753,061	BOELENS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARTIN ROGERS	1747
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT	O personnel):	
(1) MARTIN ROGERSVZ	(3)	
(2) <u>Fraser Roy</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 March 2011.		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2) applicant's representa	ative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 23</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: Guinan (Pre-Grant 2003/0060832).		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the genericached, or any other comments: <u>Applicant proposed claduring protrusion formation on the catheter. The examinal language appeared to overcome the rejection, further sedetermine whether or not is described patentable subjection.</u>	aim language which involved er stated that although this ty earch and consideration of the	the elimination of a heating step pe of amendment to the claim
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach	copy of the amendments the	
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGE INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INfrequirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	the last Office action has alre FR OF ONE MONTH OR THI NTERVIEW SUMMARY FOR	ady been filed, APPLICANT IS RTY DAYS FROM THIS M, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO